

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-30 and 41-43 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10, 12 and 18 are amended and claims 31-40 and 44 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance; (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration; and/or (3) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. More specifically, the above amendments to claims 1, 10 and 18 are merely for clarity and do not raise any new issues. These amendments are made at this time in view of comments first presented in the current Office Action. The amendment to claim 12 is to correct a typographical error. No new issues are raised. Entry is therefore proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Office Action rejects the claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over various combinations of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0060211 to Chern et al. (hereafter Chern), U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0080063 to Bloebaum et al. (hereafter Bloebaum), U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0088637 to Hatano et al. (hereafter Hatano), U.S. Patent 6,681,109 to Leifer, U.S. Patent 6,256,498 to Ludwig, U.S. Patent 6,603,837 to Kesanupalli and U.S. Patent 6,600,919 to Kawase. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites that the location tracking includes receiving an inherent number given to a base transceiver station controlling the mobile terminal and a tracking location of the mobile terminal through carrying out on a continuous basis from a network.

As an example, the present specification describes that a MSC 50 may track the location of the MT 10 using radio determination and that the location tracking information is continuously updated. Therefore, the present specification teaches tracking the location of the MT continuously.

In contrast, Chern discloses in paragraph [0043] that when a user requests information, a handset 130 provides a location of the handset 150 to a server 136 across a wireless network 140. Chern also discloses in paragraph [0050] that if position information is required, a method proceeds from step 204 to step 212 (FIG. 3), where a position determination device 134 acquires a position of the handset 130. In one implementation, the position determination occurs somewhat constantly while the handset 130 (or a hands-free unit 132) is powered on. If the position determination device 134 is situated in the hands-free unit 132, then the hands-free unit 132 provides the position data to the handset 130 for transmission to the server 136 over the wireless network 140 (step 214). Thus, Chern teaches that the position determination device 134 transmits the location of the handset 130 only when requested. Accordingly, Chern does not teach or suggest receiving an inherent number given to a base transceiver station controlling the mobile terminal and a tracking location of the mobile terminal through carrying out on a continuous basis from a network. Bloebaum and Hatano (and the other applied references) do

not teach or suggest these features of independent claim 1 missing from Chern. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites that tracking the location includes receiving an inherent number given to a base transceiver station controlling the mobile terminal and a tracking location of the mobile terminal through carrying out on a continuous basis from a network. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 18 recites that the location tracking procedure includes receiving an inherent number given to a base transceiver station controlling the mobile terminal and a tracking location of the mobile terminal through carrying out on a continuous basis from a network. For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, independent claim 18 defines patentable subject matter.

Additionally, independent claim 23 recites storing a plurality of English conversational multimedia phrases relating to a plurality of conversations relevant to a restaurant, and determining a present location of a mobile terminal when an English conversation service is requested from the mobile terminal. Independent claim 23 also recites transmitting a selected one of the plurality of the restaurant related English conversational multimedia phrases to the mobile terminal when it is determined that the present location of the mobile terminal is a restaurant.

Reply to Office Action dated November 1, 2005

Kawase relates to an international roaming and cellular phones. In Kawase, a cellular phone is programmed to convert language and display the converted language by receiving a country ID code from the base station at the country. Thus, the language conversions are performed by a cellular phone storing a language dictionary. Thus, Kawase does not teach or suggest transmitting a selected one of the plurality of the restaurant related English conversational multimedia phrases to the mobile terminal when it is determined that the present location of the mobile terminal is a restaurant. The Office Action cites Kawase's col. 4, lines 15-67 for the claimed features. However, this section does not relate to transmitting specific features to a mobile terminal. Leifer does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 23 missing from Kawase. Thus, independent claim 23 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 23 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-4, 6-13, 15-30 and 41-43 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the

Serial No. **10/040,759**


Docket No. **K-0369**

Reply to Office Action dated November 1, 2005

application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FRESHNER & KIM, LLP



David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kah

Date: April 11, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610